

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION**

GEOTAG INC. and GEOTAG, INC.

Plaintiff,

VS.

CIRCLE K STORE, INC. et al.

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 2:11-cv-405

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

**DEFENDANT GROUPE DYNAMITE, INC.'S ANSWER, DEFENSES, AND
COUNTERCLAIMS TO PLAINTIFF'S FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT**

Defendant Groupe Dynamite, Inc. d/b/a Garage (“Groupe Dynamite”) hereby sets forth its Answer and affirmative defenses to Plaintiffs GeoTag Inc. and GeoTag, Inc.’s (collectively “GeoTag” or “Plaintiffs”) First Amended Complaint for Patent Infringement (“Complaint”), as well as their counterclaims against GeoTag. The numbered paragraphs below correspond to the same numbered paragraphs in the Complaint.

ANSWER TO COMPLAINT

Responding to the enumerated paragraphs of GeoTag’s Complaint, Groupe Dynamite states as follows:

PARTIES

1. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 1 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

2. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 2 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

3. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 3 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

4. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 4 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

5. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 5 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

6. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 6 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

7. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 7 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

8. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 8 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

9. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 9 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

10. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 10 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

11. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 11 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

12. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 12 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

13. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 13 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

14. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 14 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

15. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 15 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

16. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 16 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

17. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 17 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

18. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 18 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

19. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 19 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

20. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 20 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

21. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 21 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

22. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 22 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

23. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 23 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

24. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 24 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

25. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 25 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

26. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 26 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

27. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 27 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

28. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 28 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

29. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 29 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

30. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 30 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

31. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 31 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

32. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 32 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

33. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 33 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

34. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 34 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

35. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 35 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

36. Groupe Dynamite admits that it is a Canadian corporation with its principal place of business at 5592 Ferrier Street, Town of Mont-Royal, Quebec H4P 1M2, Canada. Groupe Dynamite admits that it may be served through its president at 5592 Rue Ferrier Street, Town of Mont-Royal, Quebec H4P 1M2, Canada.

37. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 37 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

38. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 38 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

39. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 39 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

40. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 40 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

41. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 41 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

42. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 42 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

43. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 43 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

44. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 44 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

45. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 45 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

46. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 46 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

47. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 47 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

48. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 48 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

49. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 49 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

50. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 50 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

51. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 51 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

52. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 52 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

53. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 53 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

54. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 54 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

55. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 55 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

56. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 56 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

57. Groupe Dynamite admits that Paragraph 57 of the Complaint purports to set forth an action for patent infringement arising under the Patent Laws of the United States, but denies that GeoTag has any viable claim thereunder. Groupe Dynamite admits that this Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of GeoTag's Complaint, but denies the legal sufficiency of GeoTag's claims and allegations. Groupe Dynamite denies that it infringes any valid claim of the '474 Patent. Groupe Dynamite denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 57.

58. As to the allegations directed toward Groupe Dynamite, Groupe Dynamite admits only that its websites are used and/or accessible in this district, and denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 58. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations regarding other parties in this matter.

PATENT INFRINGEMENT

59. Groupe Dynamite admits that United States Patent No. 5,930,474 ("the '474 Patent") is titled "Internet Organizer for Accessing Geographically and Topically Based Information," but denies that the '474 Patent was duly and legally issued on July 29, 1999.

60. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the allegations contained in Paragraph 60 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

61. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the allegations contained in Paragraph 61 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

62. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the allegations contained in Paragraph 62 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

63. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the allegations contained in Paragraph 63 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

64. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the allegations contained in Paragraph 64 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

65. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the allegations contained in paragraph 65 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

66. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the allegations contained in Paragraph 66 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

67. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the allegations contained in Paragraph 67 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

68. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the allegations contained in Paragraph 68 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

69. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the allegations contained in Paragraph 69 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

70. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the allegations contained in Paragraph 70 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

71. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the allegations contained in Paragraph 71 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

72. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the allegations contained in Paragraph 72 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

73. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the allegations contained in Paragraph 73 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

74. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the allegations contained in Paragraph 74 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

75. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the allegations contained in Paragraph 75 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

76. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the allegations contained in Paragraph 76 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

77. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the allegations contained in Paragraph 77 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

78. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 78 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

79. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 79 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

80. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 80 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

81. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 81 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

82. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 82 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

83. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 83 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

84. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 84 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

85. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 85 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

86. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 86 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

87. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 87 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

88. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 88 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

89. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 89 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

90. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 90 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

91. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 91 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

92. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 92 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

93. Groupe Dynamite denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 93 of the Complaint.

94. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 94 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

95. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 95 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

96. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 96 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

97. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 97 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

98. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 98 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

99. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 99 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

100. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 100 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

101. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 101 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

102. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 102 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

103. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 103 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

104. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 104 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

105. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 105 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

106. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 106 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

107. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 107 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

108. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 108 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

109. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 109 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

110. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 110 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

111. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 111 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

112. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 112 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

113. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or accuracy of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 113 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

114. To the extent the allegations of Paragraph 114 of the Complaint are directed at Groupe Dynamite, they are denied. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations regarding other parties in this matter.

115. To the extent the allegations of Paragraph 115 of the Complaint are directed at Groupe Dynamite, they are denied. Groupe Dynamite is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegation regarding other parties in this matter.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

1. Groupe Dynamite denies that it infringes any valid and enforceable claim of the '474 Patent. Therefore, Groupe Dynamite denies that GeoTag is entitled to any of the judgments, declarations, injunctions, damages, fees, costs, or other relief prayed for in GeoTag's Complaint.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

2. Groupe Dynamite admits that the Complaint purports to demand a trial by jury pursuant to Rule 38 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

DEFENSES

3. Groupe Dynamite's Affirmative Defenses are listed below. Groupe Dynamite reserves the right to amend its Answer to add additional affirmative defenses, including instances of inequitable conduct, consistent with the facts discovered in the case.

GROUPE DYNAMITE'S FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
(FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM)

4. GeoTag's Complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted against Groupe Dynamite.

GROUPE DYNAMITE'S SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
(NON-INFRINGEMENT)

5. Groupe Dynamite does not and has not infringed, either directly, contributorily, or by inducement, any valid claim of the '474 Patent.

GROUPE DYNAMITE'S THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
(INVALIDITY)

6. Each of the claims of the '474 Patent is invalid for failure to satisfy the conditions of patentability as specified under one or more section of Title 35 of the U.S. Code, including, without limitation, 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103, 112, and/or 256.

GROUPE DYNAMITE'S FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
(PROSECUTION HISTORY ESTOPPEL)

7. On information and belief, by reasons of statements and representations made by the inventor or its assignor(s) to the United States Patent and Trademark Office during the prosecution of applications for issuance of the '474 Patent, or by reason of prior acts, GeoTag is estopped from asserting infringement of the '474 Patent under the doctrine of equivalents.

GROUPE DYNAMITE'S FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
(WAIVER, LACHES, ESTOPPEL)

8. GeoTag is barred in whole or in part from asserting the '474 Patent against Groupe Dynamite by the doctrine of waiver, laches, and/or estoppel.

GROUPE DYNAMITE'S SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
(ADEQUATE REMEDY AT LAW)

9. GeoTag is not entitled to injunctive relief because any alleged injury to GeoTag is not immediate or irreparable, and GeoTag has an adequate remedy at law.

GROUPE DYNAMITE'S SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
(FAILURE TO MARK)

10. GeoTag's claim for relief is limited in whole or in part by its failure to comply with 35 U.S.C. § 287.

11. Groupe Dynamite reserves any and all right to amend its Answer and Defenses to GeoTag's Complaint and to add additional defenses as they become apparent.

GROUPE DYNAMITE'S COUNTERCLAIMS

For its counterclaims against GeoTag, Groupe Dynamite alleges the following:

NATURE OF ACTION

1. This is a Declaratory Judgment action for a declaration of non-infringement and invalidity of the '474 Patent.

2. Groupe Dynamite, Inc. is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of Canada, with its principal place of business in the Town of Mont-Royal, Quebec, Canada.

3. GeoTag has alleged that it is a Texas Corporation, having a place of business in Plano, Texas.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

4. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this counterclaim pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §§ 101 *et seq.*, 35 U.S.C. § 1125, and 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1338, 2201, and 2202 as they arise under the Patent Laws of the United States.

5. By filing its Complaint, GeoTag has consented to the personal jurisdiction of this Court.

6. Venue is proper in this district under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b) and (c), and 28 U.S.C. § 1400.

COUNT I
(DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF NONINFRINGEMENT)

7. Groupe Dynamite hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 6 above as though fully set forth herein.

8. On information and belief, GeoTag represents that the '474 Patent was issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office on July 29, 1999.

9. On information and belief, GeoTag claims to own by assignment the '474 Patent.

10. GeoTag has asserted that Groupe Dynamite infringes the '474 Patent. Thus, an actual, substantial controversy exists between Groupe Dynamite and GeoTag concerning Groupe Dynamite's noninfringement of the '474 Patent.

11. Groupe Dynamite is not infringing, and has not infringed, directly, by inducement, contributorily, or in any way, any claim of the '474 Patent.

12. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 57 and 28 U.S.C. § 2201 et seq., Groupe Dynamite is entitled to a declaratory judgment that it does not infringe any claim of the '474 Patent.

13. The requested declaratory relief would serve the useful purpose of clarifying the legal issues and resolving GeoTag's claims of infringement.

COUNT II
(DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF INVALIDITY)

14. Groupe Dynamite hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 14 above as though fully set forth herein.

15. One or more of the claims of the '474 Patent are invalid under one or more sections of Title 35 of the United States Code, including, without limitation, 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103, 112, or 256.

16. GeoTag has asserted that the '474 Patent is valid and infringed by Groupe Dynamite. Thus, an actual, substantial controversy exists between Groupe Dynamite and GeoTag concerning the invalidity of the '474 Patent.

17. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 57 and 28 U.S.C. § 2201 et seq., Groupe Dynamite is entitled to a declaratory judgment that the '474 Patent is invalid.

18. The requested declaratory relief would serve the useful purpose of clarifying the legal issues and resolving GeoTag's claims of infringement

RESERVATION OF RIGHTS

Groupe Dynamite reserves any and all rights to amend its Counterclaims to GeoTag's Complaint and to add additional claims as they become apparent.

EXCEPTIONAL CASE

To the extent this is an exceptional case under 35 U.S.C. § 285, Groupe Dynamite is entitled to recovery from GeoTag of Groupe Dynamite's attorney's fees and costs incurred in connection with this action.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Groupe Dynamite respectfully requests that this Court enter judgment in its favor and grant the following relief:

- (a) A declaration that Groupe Dynamite does not infringe any claim of U.S. Patent No. 5,930,474;
- (b) A declaration that U.S. Patent No. 5,930,474 is invalid;
- (c) Dismissal of GeoTag's claims in their entirety with prejudice;
- (d) A declaration that GeoTag take nothing by way of its Complaint;
- (e) An order finding that this is an exceptional case and awarding Groupe Dynamite

its reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 285 and all other applicable statutes, rules, and common law;

(f) An order awarding Groupe Dynamite costs pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284; and

(g) An order awarding Groupe Dynamite such additional relief as this Court may deem just and proper under the circumstances.

JURY REQUEST

Groupe Dynamite requests a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

Dated: March 15, 2012

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Lance Vincent

Lance Vincent
Texas State Bar No. 20585580
RITCHESON, LAUFFER, & VINCENT PC
Two American Center
821 ESE Loop 323, Suite 530
Tyler, TX 75701
lancev@rllawfirm.net

Mark P. Wine (*pro hac vice* pending)
Calif. State Bar No. 189897
Thomas J. Gray (*pro hac vice* pending)
Calif. State Bar No. 191411
Benjamin S. Lin (*pro hac vice* pending)
Calif. State Bar No. 232735
ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE
LLP
2050 Main Street, Suite 1100
Irvine, CA 92614
Tel: (949) 567-6700
Fax: (949) 567-6710
mwine@orrick.com
tgray@orrick.com
blin@orrick.com

**ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT
GROUPE DYNAMITE, INC. D/B/A
GARAGE**

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing document has been served on March 15, 2012 to all counsel of record who are deemed to have consented to electronic service via the Court's CM/ECF system per Local Rule CV-5(a)(3).

/s/ Lance Vincent